

# THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW



S.F.T.S.  
LIBRARY

## CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| EDITORIAL .....   | 33   |
| THE IDEA OF KINGSHIP IN THE OLD TESTAMENT .....   | 34   |
| By the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., D.D., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafers, S.A.        |      |
| THE RISE OF THE DOGMA OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IN THE MIDDLE AGES .....                        | 45   |
| By the Rev. Professor Hermann Sasse, D.Theol., Immanuel Theological Seminary, Adelaide. |      |
| CORRESPONDENCE .....  | 54   |
| BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES .....  | 55   |
| (See inside back cover.)  |      |

PRICE: THREE SHILLINGS

# THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

## EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A.  
Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.

THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.

THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D.,  
Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D.,  
Dunedin.

THE REV. PRINCIPAL D. S. HOPKIRK, M.A., B.D., B.Litt.,  
Ph.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. PRINCIPAL D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D.,  
M.Th., D.Phil., Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.,  
Edinburgh.

THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.

THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne

THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed.,  
Brisbane.

---

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in  
the exposition of the Christian Faith.  
The Editors are not responsible for  
every opinion that may be expressed.

---

## ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

---

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded  
to the Editors, The Manse, 304 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn,  
E.2, Victoria, Australia. Subscribers in New Zealand should  
forward their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom,  
P.O. Box 389, Dunedin.

## Annual Subscription:

Ten Shillings, including postage. (Foreign, 10/6; U.S.A., \$1.20.)



# THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XVIII

JUNE, 1959

No. 2

## Editorial

It is fitting that a journal bearing our designation should briefly note that 1959 is not only the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Calvin, but also the quarter centenary of the definitive Latin edition of *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. The significance of this Genevan publication — a notable production of the distinguished printer, Robert Stephens, with its beautiful folio and elegant Roman characters — has been stated by the late Dr. B. B. Warfield thus: "It was not only, then, in 1559 that the 'Institutes' as we know the book was finished. Throughout the whole quarter of a century from the stay in Angouleme in 1534 to the appearance of this, its eighth edition, it was in a true sense in the making, and not until its appearance in this form was it completed. The changes it had undergone since its composition were immense — quintupling its size, revolutionising its arrangement, changing its very purpose and proposed audience. And yet through all these changes it remained in a true sense the same book, and bore in its bosom precisely the same message" (*Calvin and Calvinism*, p. 389).

In its later form the "Institutes" was intended by Calvin as a text book for theology and as such it quickly took its place as the Reformed *Summa*, being translated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into many European languages. In the two following centuries its influence waned so that even its total eclipse was predicted, but in our generation it has come back in contemporary study and discussion. This has been promoted in English-speaking countries by the recent re-issue of the Beveridge translation of 1845, the American publishers (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids) by their re-publishing of the entire Edinburgh edition of Calvin's works having greatly stimulated the revival of interest in the Reformer generally. Further, it is with pleasure that we anticipate the intimated publication in the Library of Christian Classics (S.C.M. Press, London, and Westminster Press, Philadelphia) of a new translation, by Dr. J. T. McNeill, into modern idiom of what Albert Ritschl has described as "the masterpiece of Protestant theology."

## The Idea of Kingship in the Old Testament

The aim of this paper is to raise the question whether the idea of the Sacral Kingship, which Scandinavian Old Testament scholars have taken the lead in developing in recent years, is compatible with the basic faith of Israel in the LORD who had brought them out of Egypt and made them His people, and to give some account of the fresh light which has been thrown on this question by a recent book.

It would seem that the request of the elders of Israel to Samuel in I Sam. 8:5, "Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations," was not as innocent as it looks. Samuel, in ch. 8 and 10:17-end and ch. 12, grants the request with grave misgivings and serious warnings for the future. For us, light is thrown on the request that they should have a king "like all nations," by the new knowledge that has lately been gained about the place of the king in the cultic pattern of the ancient Near East. Prof. Mowinckel in *He that Cometh* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1956), p. 23-4, quotes a summary by Prof. S. H. Hooke of the view that all the ancient near eastern religions, Babylonian, Canaanite and Israelite, were here dominated by a coherent pattern of myth and ritual: "At its centre stands the king, himself divine, the offspring or the incarnation of the god, who in the cult *is* at the same time the god himself, so that in dramatic form he lives or endures the entire 'myth' of the god, his deeds and his experiences. The god is thought of particularly as the god of fertility and creation. The most important cult festival is that of the New Year, when the world is created anew. In it the king goes through the humiliation and death of the god (originally in actual fact, later in the person of a substitute king who was really put to death, and finally only symbolically), his resurrection, combat and victory, and his 'sacred marriage' with the fertility goddess, and thereby creates the world and makes its prosperity and blessing secure for the New Year. As we have seen, it is thought that this pattern left its stamp on the cultic practice of the entire Near East, including that of Israel, but partly in such a way that the pattern was 'disintegrated.'"

All this is sufficiently "pagan." But Israel, from the time of Joshua's invasion, had been in contact with the pagan culture of the Canaanites, learning from them the arts of agriculture, and adapting from them the three agricultural festivals. Its earliest organisation in Canaan



was that of the League of the Tribes, or amphictyony; we have learnt from Prof. Martin Noth that the account of the institution of the amphictyony in Josh. 24 is to be regarded as in substance authentic. But in the Philistine invasions of the 11th century the Ark was captured, Shiloh was destroyed, and the unity of Israel was all but broken in pieces.

It was at this very grave crisis that the elders of Israel asked Samuel for a king, as the only means by which the nation could possibly survive, and the request had plainly to be granted. Saul led them against the Philistines, not without success, till his defeat and death at Mount Gilboa. After him David, that born leader of men, won quite amazing victories on every side, and took Jerusalem and made it the capital of a united nation.

But this meant that in David's reign, and still more in that of Solomon, Israel came under "pagan" influence as never before. It now became "civilised" as never before; it took its place among the nations. Solomon had Phoenician craftsmen to build his temple and palace, to help organise his great commercial enterprise, to build his "ships of Tarshish" and make his metal-foundry at Ezion-geber. He multiplied his foreign connections with his many wives, with his trade in chariots and horses, and his control of the Arabian trade-routes. It was inevitable, therefore, that religious ideas and practices should come in with the rest; and was the idea of the Sacral Kingship one of these? For in Israel, from the time of Saul, the king was thought of as standing in a special relation to JHVH, as "JHVH's Anointed" (*Messiah*), so that in I Sam. 24:5 it seems to David almost sacrilege to have cut off the skirt of Saul's robe; and with the royal anointing in I Sam. 16:13 goes a special gift of the Spirit of JHVH.

At this point, having our original question in mind, it will be well to summarise the differences which marked off the kingship in Israel from that of "all the nations." For reasons of space, we can only do this rapidly and briefly.

(i) Mowinckel shows (in *He that Cometh*, pp. 27 ff.) that while in Egypt the Pharaoh was thought of as a divine person, and the monarchy as part of the cosmic order itself, in Mesopotamia (pp. 32 ff.) and Canaan (pp. 52 ff.) the king was regarded as a human person, chosen by the god as his vicegerent and proxy, to be the channel through which the divine blessing flowed down upon the land; and the fact that the king in Israel was JHVH's Anointed shows that here there was a partly similar idea. But there

was this difference: that in Israel the kingship was manifestly a quite recent introduction. We have in Deut. 26:5-9 and Josh. 24:2-13 statements of Israel's tradition about its origins in the north-east, its Sojourn in Egypt and its Exodus out of Egypt, and its entry into Canaan. These were its ancestral memories; the kingship was quite recent.

(ii) Israel had already its own law; its Decalogue had been given by Moses at Sinai. The king also came under the law. So we find in Israel a thing happening that would have been impossible in any of the surrounding nations: namely, that when a king breaks JHVH's commandments a prophet goes to him and rebukes him. Samuel stands in a position of authority towards Saul. Nathan denounces David over the affair of Bathsheba; Micaiah and Elijah similarly stand up to Ahab, and Amos to Jeroboam II (Amos 7:10 ff.), and Isaiah both to Ahaz and to Hezekiah; for when in Isa. 30 and 31 the prophet denounces the Egyptian alliance, it is Hezekiah's policy that he is attacking.

Similarly, as regards the law: Deut. 17:14-20 contains the law about the king. The king must be "one from among thy brethren"; and he must not "multiply horses to himself . . . neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away; neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold" — in other words, not like Solomon. Further, he is told that he must "write him a copy of this law in a book . . . and he shall read therein all the days of his life . . . that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren." It was true that the king administered the law, but he himself was none the less subject to it.

(iii) Yet again, among Israel's neighbours the purpose of the annual royal festival was to provide *security* of peace, prosperity and well-being. But in Israel no sort of bargain for such security can be made; it is typical of the prophet that he is heard saying, "JHVH hath a controversy with His people, and He will plead with Israel" (Micah 6:2), to remember Who He is, to remember His mighty acts, to seek Him, to trust in His faithfulness and mercy. Israel stands under His judgment.

And so, when the time came that all the inconceivably worst things happened to Israel, as the prophets had said they would — when the monarchy came to an end, the city and the temple were destroyed and the survivors were deported into exile — then a miracle happened, the miracle that Israel did not perish, but passed through a death to a resurrection of life. This happened because the God of



Israel was a God who stood outside and above His people, a God who had freely chosen it to be His people, a God who of old had delivered it from bondage in Egypt by His own outstretched arm alone and had united it to Himself by the Covenant. He was not one of the gods whom men make in their own image.

On grounds such as these some scholars have rejected the whole conception of cult drama in Israel each New Year's Day, in which a divine battle myth, borrowed from Canaan or Babylon, was re-enacted with the king taking the role of the victorious God. See Wright, *The Old Testament against its Environment*, pp. 60-68. Prof. Norman Snaith has stood out as a doughty opponent of the Myth and Ritual School, in his book *The Jewish New Year Festival*.

It does not fall within the scope of this paper to investigate how far the various scholars who have held the view which we are considering have found it can be seen in the Old Testament, and have treated the pre-exilic religion of Israel as not different in essentials from any other of the ancient religions of the Near East. There have been such scholars; on the other hand, such scholars as Mowinckel, Aage Bentzen and Harald Riesenfeld have a clear conception of the uniqueness of Israel's faith. I purpose rather to give an account at some length of a recent book which upholds the Sacral Kingship, but which "starts with the Bible evidence, and then sees what light Babylon and Ugarit can provide," which "does not attack Professor Mowinckel or even the Uppsala school," but shows "a more excellent way" and indeed offers "a new solution" of the problem. It is indeed notable that these words are Prof. Snaith's; they are from his very appreciative review in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1957, of Prof. Aubrey Johnson's book *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (University of Wales Press, Cardiff,<sup>1</sup> 1955; English price 12/6).

This book consists mainly of an expository study of twenty-four psalms, each of which is quoted in full, in a new translation by the author. They are treated as liturgical pieces, and the aim throughout is to learn the meaning of the actual phrases which the psalmists use, without recourse to emendation of the text, apart from the entirely legitimate practice of re-vocalising in many instances the consonantal text. In one such place, the last two words of Ps. 48, which

1. I regret that when I wrote this paper I had not been able to see *Myth, Ritual and Kingship*, ed. S. H. Hooke (Oxford, 1958), which contains an essay by Prof. Johnson.

the commentators all regard as corrupt, he confesses that he himself had at one time attempted to emend the text, till he discovered that by doing so he was "destroying a valuable piece of evidence and an important link in his argument!" (p. 81 note 1). It is interesting to find that all these psalms are treated by him as belonging to the period of the Monarchy. In the period of Literary Criticism, most of them were treated as post-exilic, on the ground that the conceptions found in them, with regard for instance to the relation of Israel to the other nations, were dependent on 2-Isaiah; but now it appears that the dependence was the other way round. We shall see that, according to his exposition, much material in these psalms is derived from Canaanite sources, but that this material has been transformed by the Exodus-Sinai tradition of Israel's faith and the conception of God which this involved.

I will now give a free exposition, with Prof. Johnson's own very kind consent, of the argument of his book, not following his method of slowly building up his thesis from the evidence, but making my own summary of the results. I need not say that my desire is that the reader of this paper will take the first opportunity of studying the book itself.

There was an *Autumn Festival in Israel*, but we are told strangely little about the manner of its observance; it must be remembered that if it was, as will appear, a royal festival, no such royal festival could have been celebrated after 587 B.C. It was in the autumn, in the seventh month, that Solomon's temple was dedicated, I Kings 8:2, and similarly in the eighth month that Jeroboam instituted his rival festival, I Kings 12:26-33. These will have coincided with the Feast of Ingathering at the end of the agricultural year, Ex. 23:16 (Book of the Covenant) and Ex. 34:22 (J), or Tabernacles, Deut. 16:13 and Lev. 23:33 ff. (H); in Lev. 23:43 the "booths" are related to the wilderness-period; cf. Neh. 8:13-18. In Numb. 29:12-38 the sacrifices offered then are specified. This is all, except for the late post-exilic Zech. 14:16-17, which links this Feast with the Prayer for Rain; and it goes without saying that such a prayer would naturally be offered at the pre-exilic Feast of Ingathering. As we shall see, the psalms bear this out.

For the Psalms presuppose in many instances a liturgical background. Psalm 1, to be sure, does not; but Psalm 2 involves a whole series of difficult allusions. Prof. Johnson guides us in seeking to give an exact meaning to



the phrases which the psalmists actually use. The results come out somewhat as follows:

(i) *Liturgical allusions.* A *procession* is implied, and almost described, in Ps. 68:18, where the king makes a triumphal procession to the temple after a campaign; vss. 24-27 describe the singers and minstrels; of the tribes which take part, Benjamin and Judah are mentioned from the south, and Zebulun and Naphtali from the far north; and "the Fountain of Israel," vs. 26, can only be Gihon, from which therefore the procession starts. Vs. 1 implies that it is headed by the Ark, cf. Numbers 10:35. A procession is likewise implied in Ps. 48:12, as we shall see. So in Ps. 118:19 the king (for presumably it is he) bids the temple gates to be opened, and in vss. 22-26 the priests within bid him welcome; at 27, having entered, he orders the sacrifice to begin.

The *Ark* is alluded to at Ps. 99:1, but no procession is implied. Ps. 24 could belong to the occasion when David brought the Ark into the sanctuary, cf. JHVH "mighty in battle"; Ps. 132 belongs to a liturgical celebration of this, rather than to the occasion itself, as vs. 10 shows; and Ps. 47:5 can refer to the Ark going up into the sanctuary.

The *Prayer for Rain* is implied in Ps. 84, a psalm of country people going up to Zion to the Feast at which they will pray for the king, vs. 9; for in vs. 6 they speak of the "early rain" which will soon make the parched ground "a place of springs" — the answer to the Prayer for Rain is as good as already given. So in Ps. 68:9 there is "plentiful rain," which is withheld from "the rebellious" vs. 6, who are left to dwell in an arid waste. In Ps. 29 there is the Thunderstorm, with its rain which assures *shalom*, i.e., agricultural prosperity, vs. 11.

(ii) *Canaanite material, here seen as transformed to carry a very different meaning.* We may begin with Ps. 29, which is a hymn in honour of JHVH as the Lord of Nature, but which, as comparison with the Ugaritic texts has proved, seems to have been in its origin a Canaanite poem to Baal as the storm-god, and not to have been greatly altered. (Yet not so long ago we were being told that JHVH was in origin a storm-god!) But here it is He who rules Nature, and the *bene 'Elim*, the gods, are bidden to ascribe to Him the glory due to His Name, vss. 1-2. Likewise there is Canaanite material in Ps. 95, esp. 4-5; and as in Ps. 29:10, He is a Great King above all gods. But later in this psalm we come to Exodus-material, from Israel's own tradition, for He is the Shepherd of Israel, vs. 7; and then, "O that *today* ye would hearken to His

Voice" (for "His Voice" cf. 29.3 ff.) and take warning from the sin of your forefathers at Meribah and Massah, vss. 8-11. This is echoed in Ps. 81, esp. vs. 13. Israel owes to JHVH moral obedience, righteousness (*zedek*).

Next we come to *Melchizedek*. When David took Jerusalem, he did not exterminate the Jebusites, but treated them and their traditions with great respect. He bought Araunah's threshing-floor, and did not confiscate it. It can be David's own doing that Gen. 14 appears, a document strange to its context, in the J-narrative. There is much to suggest that David saw in the cultic tradition of Jebus several things which could be of the highest importance for the future growth of Israel in obedience to JHVH, in the way of *zedek*. First, there is the name Melchi-Zedek, which in itself was suggestive; and Prof. Johnson shows that *melek*, king, seems to have been already a divine name in Canaan, quoting the names of Melkarth god of Tyre and Milcom of Ammon, and a number of men's names such as Ahimelech, Abimelech, and Melchishua son of Saul. Can it be, then, that the phrase "JHVH is King" was introduced first by David? Psalms 93, 97 and 99 begin with it, and it occurs repeatedly in the psalter. It was of the first importance for a right view of the Monarchy that the Kingship of JHVH should always be seen as standing behind that of the human king, as is said in I Sam. 12:12-15. Cf. II Sam. 23:1-7, a beautiful poem which can well be David's own.

Then there is the name '*Elyon*, "the Most High," which occurs four times in Gen. 14:18-22, and as a Name of JHVH, in Pss. 18:13, 21:7, 47:2 and many other psalms. It is interesting that in Pss. 47:5 and 9, and 97:9, there is a word-play on '*Elyon* and '*alah*, to ascend: in Ps. 47, as He "ascends" to the sanctuary, so He is "exalted" as King over all nations.

We meet much Canaanite material in the psalms in which JHVH is praised as *the Lord of Nature*. In the Ugaritic texts, Baal was the "Rider on the Clouds"; and this phrase occurs in Ps. 68:33, and is implied in Ps. 48:2, where "the north," *Zaphon*, has nothing to do with the topography of Jerusalem: it was the name of the mythological Mountain where Baal had his throne. In Ps. 46:2-4, the God of Israel is spoken of as having rule over the Cosmic Sea, which like the Babylonian *Tiamat* stood as a symbol of the Powers of Darkness, and as able to cause the streams of it to minister to the well-being of the City of God, the holy place of '*El 'Elyon*; cf. also Pss. 93:3-4, 18:4, 15.



In Ugarit, *Death (Mot)* was a deity, the enemy in the cosmic battle. This word "Death" appears in the psalms under review, at Pss. 18:4, 48:14, 68:20, 89:48 and 118:17-18, but nowhere as a deity. In Ps. 48 the enemies against whom the battle is fought are quite plainly the kings of the earth, vss. 4-6; in Prof. Johnson's words, "the mass-attack of 'Death' is obviously portrayed as an onslaught by the kings (and *ipso facto the nations*) of the earth," that is, by the world-powers which are opposed to JHWH's righteous moral order and make for anarchy. Thus the Canaanite word, familiar to the people, is picked up, but is used as a mere personification of the forces of evil. In vs. 14 of this psalm, he translates (by re-vocalising the consonants — *'al maveth* for *'al muth*) "God . . . is our Leader against death," thus making sense of a sentence which has been the despair of commentators. The same equation of "Death" with hostile kings appears in the other psalms also; thus, for instance, it is quite clear in 68 and in 118, where in vs. 13 it seems that their leader is directly addressed.

What then is *the relation of Israel to the other nations*? Israel did not live in a vacuum, either before the Exile or after; and in Ps. 97 we find JHWH's *zedek* "openly showed in the sight of the nations," vs. 2; let the image-worshipping nations see the defeat of their attempts to overthrow His rule, 7-9, and let His own people, for their part, be sure that they "hate evil" and trust Him who delivers them, 10-12. Ps. 82 shows the background to this. The gods of the nations (cf. Deut. 32:8-9) are arraigned in the heavenly court for their misrule; instead of helping the weak and fatherless, they aid and abet "the wicked" who oppress them, and so overthrow the moral basis of society, vs. 5. Therefore, though they are called *'Elohim*, they are sentenced to die as men die, while He alone lives and reigns.

(iii) *The Davidic king and JHWH's Covenant with David*. Of the nation's life, regarded as a psychic whole, the king is the focus; he is JHWH's Anointed (*Messiah*), and a channel of His blessing to the nation. But if in other nations he was regarded as a semi-divine person, in Israel it was clear that he was a man, liable to sin. The central passage here is Ps. 89:19-37, where it is said clearly that JHWH's Covenant with David is an everlasting Covenant, so that if the kings of David's line can and do sin, they will fall under His judgment, yet JHWH's Covenant will stand and His purpose will not fail. Here is an eschatological note; we shall see how the psalmists look forward

(as Isaiah did, in 9:2-7, 11:1-9) to another David, a future ideal king, in whom JHVH's purpose would be realised on earth. In Ps. 72, a psalm for a king, he is shown as called to rule in righteousness; and in the latter part of the psalm the eschatological note comes in, when he is promised universal dominion.

But *what part did the king play in the Autumn Festival?* We have seen that the psalms presuppose a festival, with prayer for rain and a procession, and that they celebrate unweariedly the Kingship of JHVH. Did the human king take a part in this?

We have mentioned Ps. 48 more than once, but we have still to deal with vs. 9, where the EVV. wrongly translate "we have thought on" Thy *chesed* in the midst of Thy temple. But the word *damah* does not mean that; it means "to compare," as in Ps. 89:6, and so, to compare the hoped-for future with the present, as in Isa. 10:7, where the Assyrian king "pictures" his future conquests. So here Prof. Johnson translates, "we have pictured" Thy *chesed*, visualised it in a Ritual Drama. Hence it is said in vs. 8, "As we have heard, so have we seen"; we have "heard" and "seen" the words and actions of the ritual. For it has not been a battle against the kings (vs.4) outside the walls; it has been *in* Jerusalem, *in* the temple (vss. 3, 8, 9), that JHVH has been seen as "our Leader against Death." This, surely, is the only way to make sense of the actual wording of the psalm.

Other psalms show *the king as engaging in a Ritual Combat*. In Ps. 18:4, we are shown the king's combat with "Death"; human enemies are in mind throughout, as the whole psalm shows, and at the end he bears rule over the nations. But the conflict is pictured in supernatural terms, especially where, when the outlook is blackest, JHVH comes to his aid, vss. 6-19; all the might of the Lord of Nature is displayed. But he is justified, declared righteous, for his moral integrity, 20-24, and JHVH will lead him to future universal victory. This psalm is not intelligible, surely, unless we suppose that in some way the Combat and the Victory were enacted in a Ritual Drama.

The same applies to Ps. 118, where the king is not mentioned; but his presence as the chief actor is presupposed. In vss. 1-4 there is praise to JHVH for his *chesed*; then comes the fearful conflict, and trust in JHVH in the midst of it, 5-14. As we have seen, having been delivered from "Death," 17-18, he approaches the sanctuary



in the procession, 19, and is greeted by the priests within, 22-26.

Ps. 89, says Prof. Johnson, is to be taken in the same way; vss. 38 ff. are *not* a later addition. JHVH has permitted the defeat and humiliation of His Anointed in a conflict which seems likely to prove mortal; but it is part of the liturgical drama, and the king brings the liturgy to a close by pleading for deliverance, 46-51.

While then Ps. 89 speaks of the Davidic king as sinful in vss. 30-32, other psalms emphasise strongly his moral integrity; yet it is these, especially Pss. 18 and 118, which show that his deliverance is by the direct act of JHVH alone. And if these psalms were written for the actual human kings, the eschatological motif is clearly present of the ideal king in whom JHVH's purpose is at last to be fulfilled.

So we come finally to the psalms which speak of *the king as JHVH's (adopted) Son*: 89:27 (cf. 2 Sam. 7), 2.7, and by implication 110:1. In Ps. 2, the kings of the earth, who through the years have struggled to thwart JHVH's purpose, must at last acknowledge their defeat when He enthrones His king upon Mount Sion, decrees that he is His Son, begotten this day, and promises him universal dominion. The kings are warned to learn wisdom at last, 10-12. (But "Kiss the Son" in vs. 12 must be wrong, for the world *bar* is Aramaic and not Hebrew; perhaps the original reading was in some way parallel to vs. 11, "Serve JHVH with fear.") Ps. 110 begins, like a prophetic oracle, with the words *ne' um JHVH*: "Sit thou at My Right Hand, while I make thy enemies a stool for thy feet." The Anointed is re-born, at the spring of Gihon at dawn, vs. 3, to rule on the throne of David and to hold the traditional Jerusalem-priesthood of Melchizedek, and the 'Adon at his right hand comes to the aid of His hard-pressed Messiah, for He is "mighty in battle" (Ps. 24).

Prof. Johnson's book on the Sacral Kingship is thus almost entirely a study in the psalms, and it might have for a sub-title "The Davidic Covenant." It gives us quite a new picture of the inwardness of Israel's religion in the time of the Monarchy, and shows how the Canaanite material which it took into use was thoroughly transformed to frame a pattern of Sacral Kingship utterly different from the general "cultic pattern of the ancient Near East." Hence, to recall our question at the beginning of this paper, there is no discrepancy at all between *this* Sacral Kingship and Israel's Exodus-faith.

A question might perhaps be asked about Pss. 48 and 89. Dr. Johnson's exegesis of Ps. 48 does indeed appear to hold good, and to show the only way in which a clear meaning can be given to all the phrases of the psalm. But is not a historical reference still possible, to the deliverance of the City in 701 B.C.? Ps. 48 is quoted in Lam. 2.15, written after the assault of the "kings of the earth" had prevailed in 587 B.C.; could it have been written in Hezekiah's reign, when the historical deliverance was freshly in mind, possibly for the next Autumn Festival? So with Ps. 89; it is possible to accept Prof. Johnson's contention that the psalm was always a unity, and that the vivid picture of the humiliation of the king in vss. 38 ff. is not a later addition, and at the same time to ask whether it had not a historical occasion in the later 7th century, perhaps after Josiah's death.

In any case the City did fall in 587 B.C. and the Davidic Monarchy and the royal festival in the autumn did come to an end. This brings us to a point which we raised earlier: that in Israel prophets are found going to kings and accusing them of sin and uttering prophecies of doom. How does this tally with the splendid theology of the royal festival as it appears in the Psalms?

Perhaps a modern parallel will help at this point. The Liturgy of the Church of England is an example of a rite which, like these Psalms, draws a picture of a Christian nation, under its anointed Sovereign, desiring to order its life according to the principles of the Divine Rule. We can think of the Litany, which aims at covering the whole national life, canticles such as *Te Deum*, *Magnificat* and *Gloria in excelsis*, and indeed the whole liturgy as set for Christmas or Easter; all this provides a Christian counterpart, in depth as well as in range, to the liturgy of these psalms. Side by side with this we have had the utterances of a line of Christian prophets, who have denounced our clericalism and prelacy, the conditions of labour in the Industrial Revolution, our imperialism and our commercialism, as well as the favourite sins of rich and poor. In both instances, the liturgy expresses the faith by which the prophets lived, and the theological principles which they applied in practice.

But we are concerned here with Old Israel, in which the prophetic warnings of judgment came true, and the pre-exilic liturgy came to an end. Yet because the faith of Israel was based on the LORD's own mighty acts and His own choice of Israel, that faith survived, and the LORD was still found to be "the Refuge of His people"



in His hour of judgment. When the royal festival at Jerusalem came to an end, the faith which it had expressed lived on, and the psalms were still treasured, with the eschatological hope which they expressed of a future Davidic king who would be not only the LORD's Anointed but His Son, and would hold universal rule over the nations. The LORD's Covenant with David, which these psalms celebrate with such wonderful fulness, was and remains one of the great themes of the Bible.

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

## **The Rise of the Dogma of Holy Scripture in the Middle Ages**

### **I**

Unbelievable as it may seem to modern Christians, Catholic or Protestant, it is a fact that the Church existed for 1500 years without a dogmatic definition of the nature and authority of Holy Scripture. This does, of course, not mean that it had no strong and generally accepted convictions on that subject. On the contrary, during all these centuries no one doubted that the Bible in its entirety was God's Word, that God was the principal author of the Scriptures, as their human authors had written under the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, and that, therefore, these books were free from errors and contradictions, even where this did not seem to be the case. The Middle Ages had inherited this view from the Fathers who had established it in numerous exegetical and apologetical writings. These again had not wanted to establish a new doctrine. They meant to render faithfully the doctrine of Jesus and His apostles to whom, like to all people of the Old Covenant, the Old Testament Scriptures had been the undoubted Word of God. How self-evident this understanding was appears from the fact that comparatively few writings of the Fathers deal expressly with the doctrine of Scripture, as e.g. Augustine's *De Consensu evangelistarum* which has played such a great role up to our own time. Most of the innumerable Patristic references to the divine character of the Bible occur in the vast mass of exegetical writings. Theology proper has always been exposition of the Scriptures even before a professor of the Bible at Wittenberg became the Reformer of the Church. In the New Testament we find three great offices which are valid in all churches and not only in a local church, and which are conferred not by men, but by God directly. They are the offices of the Word: the apostles as the

witnesses to the Word Incarnate, the prophets who are entrusted with the proclamation of the oral word which God "puts in their mouth," and the teachers ("didaskaloi," Vulg. "doctores") whose task it is to explain the written word. Thus Paul, before he took up his great mission work as apostle, had acted as teacher in Antioch (Acts 13:1). When in the Middle Ages with the rise of the universities the ecclesiastical doctorate was renewed, its content remained the same. The exposition of Holy Scripture was entrusted to Bonaventura and Thomas when on the same day they received their degree in Paris in 1256. Theology is for Bonaventura "*scientia Sacrae Scripturae*." If Paris were his, said Aquinas, he would give it for Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew. His theological work proper was to him his lectures on the Gospel and on Romans. Dogmatics was still at the time of Luther a subject for beginners, as also Thomas wrote his *Summa theologica*, as he points out in the prologue, as a book for beginners ("incipientes"), "milk for babes in Christ." It was not necessary to tell these babes what Holy Scripture is. They were supposed to know that, and only incidental remarks in the *Summa* reveal what they were supposed to know. Thus Thomas calls God the author of the Scriptures (part I, q. 1, art. 10). The relationship between the principal author and the human authors is dealt with in the doctrine of inspiration in the Quaestiones on prophecy (II/II, q. 171-177). Several times he states that Holy Scripture cannot contain even a historical error (I, 32, 4; 102, 1). Such truths were regarded as self-evident. If occasionally they are expressed or hinted at in a doctrinal statement, like the Creed of Leo IX (A.D. 1053) which is still used at the consecration of a bishop, no new doctrine is introduced.

## II

As it is to be expected, the dogma of the Scriptures has been least developed in the East. John of Damascus, the Aquinas of the Eastern Church, has in his presentation of the Orthodox Faith no chapter on the Scriptures, but simply states in the chapter on Faith (IV, 10) after quoting Rom. 10:17: "We hear the Holy Scriptures and believe the doctrine of the Holy Spirit." Since for the Orthodox Church dogma can only be a doctrine defined by one of the Ecumenical Synods, an elaborate definition comparable to the decisions of Trent and the Vatican Council is impossible. What this difference between East and West, created by the last two Roman Councils, means or does not mean, we cannot discuss here. We have to state that during the



Middle Ages no real difference was found by either side. This is all the more important as East and West had different Bibles, as far as the Old Testament is concerned. The difference between the Septuagint and the Vulgate that had played such a great role in the discussions between Augustine and Jerome is essentially the continuation of the difference between the Bible of Jesus and the Aramaic speaking synagogue and church on the one hand, and the Bible of Stephen, Paul and the Greek speaking Church on the other. While the Koran ceases to be Holy Scripture if translated into another language, while also other holy books in the Orient are bound up with a certain language and even a certain alphabet, the Bible can be translated, and has even been translated already by the Jews, without ceasing to be the Word of God. This is, of course, not true of any translation. There are translations in which the Word of God is destroyed.<sup>1</sup> But the way in which the New Testament confirms the Septuagint or another translation shows that even varieties which to our reason seem to be contradictory can exist side by side in the Word of God.<sup>2</sup> Thus one and the same Word of God can exist in various forms, as also the biblical narratives show, and the two churches in the Middle Ages were quite right when the question of the Bible was not made one of the issues between them.

In order to understand the dogmatic problem of the Scriptures in the Middle Ages we look at the first dogmatician who deals expressly with the problem of Scripture. While Peter Lombard's famous *Sentences*, the official textbook for dogmatics still at Luther's time, does not deal with the Bible, one generation earlier Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141) in his profound *De sacramentis*, a dogmatics under the title "on the mysteries of the faith," starts with the Scriptures. He begins the prologue with the statement that theology is "*divinarum Scripturarum lectio*," the reading of the divine Scriptures. He then speaks on the nature of the Scriptures and enumerates the "books of the holy Word" ("*de numero librorum sacri eloquii*"). Following

1. As an interesting example, we quote from the Ethiopian text of Acts 27:33-37: "And they called upon the Lord, beseeching Paul, all of them, that they might eat food, and he said to them, On the tenth and the fourth day since ye ate, on the day that ye ask me for food, anoint and make ready your souls, for that which is lacking in them will be a loss to yourselves; and having thus said he took the bread of the Lord and giving thanks, he blessed and break before them, and took and ate, and they all rejoiced, and two hundred and seventy-seven souls were anointed and were satisfied" (from S. A. B. Mercer, *The Ethiopic Liturgy*, 1915, p. 331).
2. E.g., 1 Cor. 15:55 the Greek text reads: "Death is swallowed up in victory." The Hebrew text reads "*lannezech*" (forever). Theodotion transcribed "*nezech*" by "*nikos*." Such variation is not supposed to alter the true meaning.

the traditional Hebrew canon he enumerates the 22 books of the Old Testament, then what we call the Old Testament Apocrypha — Hugh does not use this name; “apocrypha” are for him Old and New Testament “pseudepigrapha,” heretical forgeries — as “books which are read, but are not written in the authoritative canon (in canone auctoritatis).” “The New Testament contains the Gospels, the Apostles, the Fathers. There are four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. Similarly four apostolic volumes (namely) the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul, the Canonical<sup>3</sup> Epistles, Revelation, which, conjoined with the 22 books of the Old Testament, make thirty, thus completing the body of the divine book. The Scriptures of the Fathers are not computed in the body of the text, because they do not add other things, but rather extend in explaining and clarifying that which is contained in the Scriptures mentioned” (Migne PL 176, 186). Apart from the interesting division of the New Testament into eight books remarkable is the negative judgment on the Old Testament apocrypha that are contained in the Vulgate (Hugh was well acquainted with the Hebrew canon and knew the Hebrew names of the books), and the positive evaluation of the Church Fathers who in his opinion belong to the “New Testament.” In the introduction to his exegetical writings (*De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris* MPL 175, 9-28) Hugh enumerates again the 22 books of the Old Testament, some “books like Wisdom, Sirach, Judith, Tobit” and the books of the Maccabees “which are being read, but not written in the canon,” and the eight books of the New Testament. While the Gospels form the first class of the New Testament writings and the Apostolic writings the second class, corresponding to the Law and the Prophets in the Old Testament, there is a third class which would correspond to the “Scriptures,” the hagiographa of the Hebrew canon. Hugh describes this third class thus: “In the third order the first class take the decretals<sup>4</sup> which we call ‘canonical,’ i.e. establishing rules (‘regulares’). Then follow the innumerable writings of the holy Fathers, as Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, Isidor, Origin, Bede and other doctors. However, these writings of the Fathers are not computed in the text of the Divine Scriptures, just as in the Old Testament there are certain books which are not contained in the canon and yet are read. . . . In these orders the convenient structure of

3. In the Middle Ages our “Catholic” epistles are often called “canonical.”

4. Church Orders, like the “Apostolic Constitution,” were also in the East sometimes included in the New Testament.



either Testament appears. For as the Law is followed by the prophets, and the prophets by the Hagiographa, so the Gospel is followed by the apostles, and the apostles in due order by the doctors."

We have given these details to show how a great theologian of the early 12th century has wrestled with the problem of the canon. It is noteworthy that not only the Eastern Church was not sure about the content of the biblical canon — the synod of 692 had confirmed several and varying lists of the books of the Bible — but that even in the Latin Church the same problem existed in spite of the official lists that existed since Damasus (A.D. 382; Denzinger 32) and Innocence I who had confirmed the canon of Carthage A.D. 397 (Denz. 92). Actually the definite canon of the Western Church was proclaimed only at Trent, though the list of Trent appears already in the Decree for the Jacobites of 1441 (Denz. 706). In the last analysis the biblical canon cannot be defined, except by an arbitrary act. This is born out by an interesting debate at the Vatican Council on the constitution "On the Catholic Faith." The question was raised what the words "sacred" and "canonical" mean if the new definition (Denz. 1787), following the decree of Trent (Denz. 783), called the books of the Vulgate "sacred and canonical." One of the most learned theologians of the Council, Bishop Gasser, replied: A sacred book is a book written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, a canonical book is a book which is recognised by the Church as sacred and therefore received into the canon. This led to the question whether all canonical books are sacred and all sacred books canonical. The first part of the question must be answered by the Roman Church in the affirmative. What about the second part? While Gasser expressed the belief that all sacred books have been received into the canon, others thought that this could not be said with certainty. The Jesuit, T. Granderath, the historian of the Vatican Council, remarks (Vol. II, p. 466) cautiously, Gasser's assumption may be correct, but it would be very difficult to prove it. In fact, it cannot be proved that a sacred book cannot have been lost. It is a question that helps to clarify the issues in the discussion of the doctrine on Holy Scripture if we ask: What would it mean to the Church if in this age of unexpected discoveries some of the lost epistles of Paul would turn up, or texts that would historically prove the authenticity of some of the growing number of the *agrapha* of our Lord in a similar way as Luke and Paul warrant the authenticity of the logion quoted Acts 20:35? One is

tempted to wish for such discovery simply to cause the churches to re-think their doctrine of Scripture and the biblical canon.

### III

Behind the question of the canon there looms another great problem, the real issue between the Catholic and the Protestant Churches: the relationship between Holy Scripture and the Church. The issue is obscured if we ask for the relationship of Scripture and Tradition which for the Western Church has become the great problem since Trent has put Scripture and Tradition on the same level as sources of doctrine. This was the real revolution of the 16th century and not the "Sola Scriptura" of the Reformation as far as this means that Holy Scripture alone can be the source of articles of faith. A glimpse at the doctrinal definitions of the Middle Ages quoted by Denzinger as teaching the ecclesiastical tradition as the second source of revelation (see Index syst. I f) shows that they do not contain this doctrine, but that it has been read into them. They speak of the preservation of the doctrine of the Fathers and Councils. Only once in a papal document seems to occur the word tradition, viz., in an admonition addressed by Gregory IX to the theologians of Paris in 1228 to retain the classical terminology, since they have to teach theology according to the "approved traditions" of the holy Fathers. Otherwise the word "traditio" occurs only as translation of the Greek "paradosis," e.g., in the decrees of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (787). It is worthwhile to look at them because they reveal that East and West had during the Middle Ages a different approach to the idea of the "tradition." The synod gives the decision on the images "following the divinely inspired teaching of our holy Fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church, for it is the Holy Spirit who dwells in it" (Denz. 302 with the Greek and the Latin text). The Greek "the-agoros didaskalia," i.e., the doctrine in which God speaks, is rendered "divinitus inspiratum magisterium." The next paragraph (Denz. 303) speaks of the preservation of "the doctrine of our holy Fathers, i.e., the tradition of the Holy Catholic Church, which from one end of the earth to the other has received the Gospel. Thus we follow Paul who has spoken in Christ (2 Cor. 2:17), and the divine circle of the Apostles and the holy Fathers, keeping the traditions ('paradoxeis,' 'traditiones,' 2 Thess. 2:14) which we have received." In another document of the same synod we read: "If any one rejects the ecclesiastical tradition, written or unwritten, be he anathema" (Denz. 308).



Here we find again a significant difference between the Eastern and the Western Church, at least as regards the terminology. While the Latin Church in the Middle Ages does not use very much the term tradition, at least not in the technical sense, "paradosis" has remained a keyword in the Eastern Church. While in the West, and not only with Hugh of St. Victor, there is a tendency to include the writings of the Fathers in the "Holy Scriptures" — time and again one can find quotations from ecclesiastical authorities introduced with "Scripture says" — in the Eastern Church Scripture becomes "Tradition." Already the canon of Nicea II quoted (Denz. 308) contains the distinction between "paradosis engraphos," which means Holy Scripture, and "paradosis agraphos" which means tradition not contained in Holy Writ. Roman theologians must understand this in their way after the decree of Trent has declared that the Gospel is contained in "written books and unwritten traditions" (Denz. 783). In the time before Trent it did not make much difference whether tradition was understood as belonging to the Scriptures, or Scripture as being written tradition. Even modern Roman theology could approve of the statement of the Orthodox Confession of Dositheos (1672): "As the author of the Scriptures and of the Church is one and the same Holy Spirit, it does not matter whether one has as teacher the Church or the Scriptures." The danger of the Eastern view is that the difference between Scripture and tradition, between canonical and non-canonical books disappears completely. The fact that nobody is able to define the border of the canon with absolute certainty does not mean that there is no such border. This is the mistake of Eastern theologians who would say with Chomjakow: "As Holy Scriptures are regarded the Old and New Testament writings as accepted by the Church. Scripture, however, has no border. For any Scripture which the Church recognises as hers is Holy Scripture. Of such nature are mainly the Confessions of the Ecumenical Creeds."

In contrast with the East the Western Church of the Middle Ages has not only avoided the term "tradition" in a surprising way, but she has also refrained from dogmatising on tradition. In vain one seeks for a theory of tradition with Aquinas or anyone else among the great schoolmen. The idea that tradition could be a second source of revelation is absolutely foreign to them. The doctrine which Hugh finds in the Fathers is nothing else than an elaboration of the doctrine of the earlier parts of the "New Testament." In this sense only can the sentence of

Leo's Creed be understood. "I accept the four Councils and venerate them like the four Gospels . . ." (Denz. 349). Also Thomas, though he assumes that human reason can know certain "preambles to the faith," as e.g. the existence of God, makes it quite clear that Holy Scripture alone can be the source of any article of faith. Referring to Augustine's saying that he could attribute inerrancy only to the canonical books and to no other writers (Ep. 82; MPL 33, 277), he says: "Our faith rests upon the revelation that was given to the apostles and prophets. It cannot be based on a revelation which might perhaps have been given to another teacher" (*Summa theol.* I, q. 1, art. 8 ad 2). If in this sense the "Sola Scriptura" is the common doctrine of the Latin Church of the Middle Ages, how, then, could the dogma of Trent arise which made tradition a second source of revelation, to be received and venerated "with equal pious affection and reverence"?

#### IV

This new dogma is the result not only of the Reformation. Its roots are to be found in the fight of three centuries about the highest authority in the Church. While outwardly the medieval papacy reached its climax after 1200, it became obvious that its authority was declining. Since that time the question had been asked whether the pope is the Antichrist. The heretical movements threatened the existence of the church in several parts of Europe. The recovery of the church in the 13th century was transitory, as the age of Boniface VIII, of the great schism, of Wiclif and Hus, of the Conciliarist Movement proved. That this development was not only the result of political, social and cultural movements, not only a revolution against a divine order, is proved by the fact that it is accompanied by a deep spiritual movement which is hidden under the turbulent surface of the late Middle Ages. The disintegration of the papal authority is accompanied by a rise of the authority of Holy Scripture, as the downfall of the political power of the pope is accompanied by the rise of the new national powers. And yet that spiritual process means more than the transition from one authority to another one, more than the transition from Papalism to Conciliarism. If the Waldensians criticised the papal church for not living up to the law of God as contained in the Scriptures, if Wiclif criticised the Roman Antichrist for having invented and introduced human traditions contrary to the Word of God, this could be understood and was understood by the church of that time as a clever attempt to combat the foe with his own weapon. Actually it was infinitely



more, as the facts show that the Waldensians in France and the Lollards in England knew by heart entire books of the Bible or even the whole New Testament in the vernacular. There was a hunger and thirst for the Word of God, that holy famine of Amos 8 sweeping through Europe.

Against this background one must read the statements of the schoolmen since Duns Scotus and Occam and their disciples about Holy Scripture as the only source of doctrine. What Hugh and Thomas had taught in this respect, was developed into a theology of "*Sola Scriptura*" which, however, did not mean an anticipation of the Reformation. As the Waldensians, the Wiclifites and Hussites remained with the medieval understanding of the Gospel as the Law of God, so the theologians of the *via moderna* remained loyal adherents of the papal church and its dogma. But there was a reaction on the part of Roman theologians against what they regarded as a wrong use of Holy Scripture. For them the Bible is a dark book. It can be understood correctly and interpreted authoritatively only by the teaching office of the Church. This is what the schoolmen stated against the Waldensians. They did not appeal to a tradition as another source of doctrine, but to the authority of the Church. In the trials against Wiclif, Hus, and Luther the idea of "tradition" plays no role whatever. What is maintained against them is solely the authority of the Church in interpreting the Bible. It seems that in these discussions some apologists of the Roman position have gone so far as to deny the absolute inerrancy of Holy Scripture. When Luther at Augsburg 1518 appealed to the *Sola Scriptura*, Cajetan, the legate of the pope to the Diet, one of the most learned Thomists of that time, called Luther's attention to the famous "error" Matth. 27:9 where a quotation from Zechariah is ascribed to Jeremiah, which shows, by the way, how many questions concerning Holy Scripture at that time still were open questions.

## V

Many of our contemporaries may look at the situation on the eve of the Reformation with the question: Would it not have been better for Christendom if all those questions which at that time were open still, including the "*sola scriptura*" and "*sola fide*" had never been answered by dogmatic decisions, especially since these decisions in the various churches that arose out of the Reformation were different and even contradictory? But the wheel of history cannot be turned back. Christendom cannot go back behind the Reformation including the Reformation of the

Roman Church made by the Council of Trent and finished by the Vaticanum with its "irreformabilis." And even if we could forget the answers given in the 16th century, the question would remain and demand an answer: What is Holy Scripture? What do we mean when we call it God's Word? What do we mean when we speak of its inerrancy? What is the relationship between the Bible and the Church? Whatever the answers may be which the churches of this century will have to give, we cannot hope to give a real answer without having studied and understood the dogmatic decisions which the various confessions of the age of the Reformation have given to a problem that has occupied the hearts and minds of Christendom for so many centuries and that will remain a problem for mankind to the end of the world. For if the Bible is, as we believe, God's Word, then its right understanding is a matter of life and death.

H. SASSE.

## Correspondence

### DR. SASSE'S REVIEW OF DR. PACKER'S BOOK

Sir,—

Since in Dr. Sasse's review in your last number of Packer's book, "*Fundamentalism*" and the Word of God, I come in for my share of blame, and since the issue raised queries the validity of all our Bible study, it seems to be my duty to enter a protest, even though it be against our beloved and revered Dr. Sasse. I am astonished that he should be so carried away by Dr. Packer's most attractive style as to bestow so glowing an encomium on his book and on the utterances of the Papal *magisterium* about the Bible since 1870; and that he should reserve till the end two criticisms, of which the first, that the book "is not satisfactory when it comes to the problem of the inerrancy concerning history" involves a major criticism of its whole argument. With the second criticism there is not space to deal here.

He endorses Packer's judgement that in my own book I do not discuss "the avowed biblicism of our Lord and His apostles, nor the biblical concepts of Scripture and its authority" (p. 142). With regard to the first of these points, it is necessary to enter a strong protest when Packer equates our Lord's view of Scripture with "the Jewish doctrine of Scripture, the only one the Bible knows" (p. 142). Others are saying this, too, and Packer, in other writings of his. But in fact our Lord roundly condemns the "Jewish" (rabbinic) doctrine of Scripture when He says, as in Mark 7:6-14, 12:24-27 and 35-37, the Pharisees and the Sadducees both misinterpret the Bible. As for St. Paul, I would refer Dr. Sasse and Dr. Packer to Earle Ellis' investigation, in *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, of the fact that St. Paul is again and again at no pains to quote his O.T. texts accurately. He says that in Paul's eyes the Jews stood on the Scripture and not *under* it; "though they extolled it, they erred because they did not know it . . . and its true meaning remained hidden from them" (cf. Rom. 2:27, 29; 7:6; 2 Cor. 3:6-7, on the "letter" and "the Spirit") . . . "In Judaism the synthesis of 'Word and 'Spirit' had been lost, and the Scriptures had become mere 'letters'; the Law had become an end in itself rather than a means to evoke faith in God's grace; through their false interpretations the Word of God had become



ineffectual. The issue of 'the Law versus Christ' here passes into Paul's understanding of Scripture itself. *Graphe* is the Spirit-carried letter, the Spirit-interpreted letter. Therefore, Paul does not hesitate to give his O.T. citations as interpretative renderings, and he is convinced that he conveys the true (i.e., the Spirit's) meaning best in this way. Thus Paul rejects the Law, yet he uses the Law; the apparent antinomy is resolved by distinguishing between the Jewish and the spiritual authority of it" (cf. Cor. 2, 2 Cor. 3:14). What the Spirit meant is known through the messianic fulfilment, as e.g. in Rom. 15:4.

Then, I am told that in my book I do not deal with "the biblical concepts of Scripture and its authority." But what are these "biblical concepts"? I find all through Dr. Packer's book the assumption that Revelation is "Propositional Revelation" (p. 91), and "the Word of God consists of *revealed truths*"; and so "the evangelical faith is a systematic and integrated whole" (p. 17). Is it, then, that what is revealed is *not* God Himself, and the Way by which we may come to Him, but *truths about Him*? Is it that the formula of the Creeds, "I believe in . . ." is incorrect, and that it ought to have been "I believe that . . ."? I am convinced that *the issue between us is that of the meaning of "Truth,"* and that he and his friends are at present wholly tied to a notion of Propositional Truth which is an uncriticised and unexamined legacy from Scholasticism and Aristotle. On this question see A. C. Outler, *The Christian Tradition and the Unity we seek*, esp. ch. III and pages 86 ff., to which it seems to me that there is no reply. The Bible for its part is innocent of Aristotelian logic, and it contains no "system" of theology; it speaks of Divine things by means of paradoxes such as "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself," because it is only by such logically "impossible" language that the mysteries of God can be set forth. On this, see Prof. I. T. Ramsey, *Religious Language* (S.C.M. Press).

It is strange that a major controversy such as this between Christians should appear to centre in a problem of Logic and Epistemology; for, honestly, I feel that I have no other major difference with Dr. Packer except this, that he is tied to an ideology, to a very questionable philosophical opinion.

There is very much more to say, but this must suffice. And what does Dr. Sasse say?

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

## Book Reviews

### THE CONFLICT WITH ROME

G. C. Berkouwer (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia), 1958, pp. 320; \$5.95.

The translation and publication of this important study by Dr. Berkouwer, Professor of Syst. Theology at the Free University, Amsterdam, is most timely. In his personal preface, the author himself points to the increasing numerical, political and cultural power of the Roman Catholics in Holland. He writes: "The conflict with Rome within the Netherlands, as well as within the United States, is not merely a matter of theology. It is a national problem, which raises the old question, whether or not we are a Protestant nation?" Does not the same hold true of the situation in Australia? In particular the post-war immigration of many Roman Catholics from the southern countries of Europe has changed the proportions considerably. And on the other hand there is the saddening fact, that so many non-Catholics are only nominally Protestant. Dr. Berkouwer himself points out more than once that Liberalism or Neo-Protestantism is not an ally of those

who want to stand in the tradition of the Reformation, but an enemy. Rightly, therefore, the translator, Dr. David H. Freeman, in his preface says: "At a time when Reformation Protestantism is threatened with extinction, not by Roman Catholicism, but by the infiltration of humanism within Protestant Churches, it is more than appropriate that the intellectual world be confronted with an authentic spokesman of historic Protestantism."

No better spokesman could be found indeed. Already before the last war Dr. Berkouwer wrote an important work on R.C. theology, under the title, *Controversy around the R.C. Dogma*, a work not less worthy of being translated. The work under review was published for the first time in Holland in 1948. Immediately after the publication, Dr. K. H. Miskotte, one of the leading (Barthian) theologians of Holland, said that this was one of the best works on R.C. theology he had ever read.

It is impossible to give a complete survey of this profound volume. It must suffice to make a few cursory remarks.

The first three chapters deal with the Church. I Unshakeable Authority? II The Church and Heresy. III The Guilt of the Church (especially dealing with the problem of the many divisions of the Church). Prof. Berkouwer sees at the basis of the R.C. doctrine of the Church the principle of "identity" between Christ and the Church (p. 23). Here one of the great controversies between Rome and the Reformation comes to the fore. "It may be faithfully summarised in the words "identity" versus "communion through the Word and the Spirit" (p. 24). As a result of this "identity" the exhortations of the N.T. have only significance for the individual believer, not for the Church. Likewise the problem of heresy becomes very simple: it is sinful separation from the Church. And as to the guilt of the Church regarding the dividedness many confessions are heard, but they only refer to the sphere of morals and practice; the official teaching office of the Church is not affected by it.

In the next four chapters the author deals with the great controversy of grace and freedom. IV The Conflict of Grace. V The Problem of the Assurance of Salvation. VI Ave Maria. VII The Communion of Saints. Here we are faced with the old, sixteenth century problem, but it appears to be a problem that is still fully alive and pertains to the heart of the gospel. In a very clarifying manner Dr. Berkouwer defends the Reformation position, both over against Rome and Modernism. Over against Rome's scheme of co-operation and synergism, Berkouwer formulates the Reformation position again in the word "correlation." In connection with the controversy around the Assurance of Faith he writes: "In the correlation between the Gospel of grace and faith is revealed the mystery of religion." Faith is not a condition to be met by man as his achievement, but it has its function, wholly within the circle of grace. And "thus the windows to eternity remain open" (p. 151).

Chapter VIII combines the two controversial issues ("identity" and "grace plus freedom") in a discussion of the R.C. conception of the Incarnation. Here we see how the two issues actually are two sides of the one fundamental issue. Rome defends the idea of a prologation of the Incarnation in the Church. Berkouwer points here to the close affinity with the views of many High Anglicans. But he also clearly shows that again the deepest conflict is the contrasting view on grace. "The discussion about the incarnation does not add anything essential but merely repeats the old arguments: synthesis versus distance, a festive spirit versus pessimism; pure humanity versus Calvin's supposed so-called grudge against human nature. Summing up all these subjects

in one 'synthesis' we may say: here, too, the discussion is about sin and grace" (p. 211).

Finally in the last chapter three different problems are combined. The relation between the liturgical movement in the Protestant Churches and Rome (highly interesting also with regard to High Church ideals in some of our Australian Churches), the relation Barth-Rome (taken up again in Dr. Berkouwer's later work on *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*), and Rome's appeal to the early Church fathers.

It is to be regretted that this volume has no Index. A scholarly work should never be without an Index! It is also to be regretted that all the notes are placed at the end of the book. It really does not add to the pleasure of reading!

I am aware that in the above few lines I have only mentioned some of the main points of Dr. Berkouwer's argument. Time and again he brings other important issues into the discussion. Incessantly we hear the voices of the Reformers, in particular of Calvin. But above all he confronts the R.C. system with the Scriptures. Having read this work again I fully agree with the words of the author: "The distance between the sixteenth and the twentieth century should not be over-estimated, at least not with respect to the essential religious conflicts." Between Rome and the Reformation there is still a conflict, and it concerns nothing less than the heart of the Gospel.

K. RUNIA.

#### THE LATTER PROPHETS

By T. Henshaw (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London), 1958, pp. 341; 30/-.

This book, like the author's *New Testament Literature*, does not pretend to make any fresh contribution to the problems involved in the subject chosen, but it surveys the findings of modern scholarship on what are commonly called the O.T. prophetic books, and presents them as a reliable introduction for the layman or theological student who is looking for something more than a popular appraisal.

The book begins with some introductory chapters on the historical background of the prophetic period, the development of prophecy and the nature of Hebrew poetry, and concludes with some useful appendices on the priesthood, sacrifice, the Messianic hope, the Israelite feasts and chronological tables. A limited but useful bibliography is also appended. The books of the prophets are treated in chronological order and each chapter follows this general pattern: life and background of the prophet, literary problems of the book, a chapter-by-chapter summary of the contents, and an assessment of the religious and historical value of the book. Most of the main contributions of modern scholarship are introduced to the reader, and the author is usually "content to state the main theories, leaving the reader to form his own opinion." Strangely enough, it is with the book of Ezekiel that the author seems to introduce more of his own judgments, and yet this is the one book on which even the great scholars speak at present with caution.

The author hardly does justice, with his one brief reference, to the place of oral tradition in the growth of the prophetic books, and although he himself warns his readers that it is inappropriate to refer to the "Latter Prophets" as the "Writing Prophets," he seems to treat them too often as if they were. The warning of some contemporary scholars, particularly Scandinavian, that this approach is anachronistic needs to be heeded more carefully. The author has obviously studied a great deal of the relevant literature, but reflects some general attitudes which are now becoming a little dated. He seems to fall short of making the O.T. prophets really live. The book



does not penetrate into the heart of Israelite prophecy, nor make clear the enduring nature of the prophetic function within the life of the people of God. Yet in spite of such criticisms one must express gratitude for a book which theological students and many others will welcome. There is no English study which covers both the critical introduction to and the contents of the O.T. prophetic books so adequately as this volume.

L. G. GEERING.

### THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE AND MYTH

By L. Malevez, S.J. (S.C.M. Press, London), 1958, pp. 215; 25/-.

The author of this lucid and stimulating discussion of the theology of Rudolf Bultmann is Professor at the Jesuit Philosophical and Theological College of Saint Albert, Louvain. As such he is committed to a substance ontology which is in conflict with Bultmann's existentialism and to doctrinal positions which go with it. To that extent the findings of the book are a foregone conclusion as they receive their elaboration in a chapter called *The Verdict of Tradition*.

The fascination and real contribution of Malevez's work lies in his fair-minded and painstaking attempt to show that for Bultmann the saving event has objective reality. In view of the number of Protestant critics who have rushed into the charge of "subjectivism," it is the more admirable that Malevez has resisted this temptation, considering that in his case the provocation was even greater. Instead, he clearly recognises that Bultmann intends to preserve the objective nature of the saving event and that this objectivity is given for him in the kerygma and in the existential encounter with it. That this "objectivity" is not sufficient when judged by Malevez's own presuppositions is obvious.

Nor is it surprising that he complains, like other critics before him, of the "cruel poverty" to which the Christian Faith is reduced in Bultmann's interpretation. He naturally deplores, with the rest of us, that the Easter Faith and the belief in resurrection have been shed in the process of demythologising. On the other hand, he does less than justice to Bultmann when he complains that Christianity has been "reduced to preaching, there is no worship; no real sacrament and the preaching itself is reduced to this mediocre theme: you are forgiven sinners." Admittedly, Bultmann's is not the "wealth" of an elaborate ceremonial and hierarchical organisation, nor is there room in his theology for elaborate speculations concerning the nature of the transcendent reality. The "richness" of his theology is of another kind, and it proves its abundance in existential settings without number in which the believer listens, with ever new amazement, to the message that he is a forgiven sinner, a message that appears monotonous and barren only when lifted out of its existential setting. Treated in this way, it is no different from the water-lily which you tear from its roots at your own peril; and as it wilts in your hands you wonder why you did it.

It is impossible to do justice to the wealth of questions which Malevez's book raises within the limits of this review. It is obvious that a fundamental barrier divides Malevez from Bultmann's theology, but he has cast not only a penetrating but a sympathetic look across this barrier, and the result is a work which no student of Bultmann should miss to consult.

H. H. REX.

## THE BOOK OF THE LAW

By G. T. Manley (Tyndale Press, London), 1957, pp. 192; 12/6.

## COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

By C. A. Simpson (Basil Blackwell, Oxford), 1957, pp. 197; 62/- (Aust.).

These two books, published in 1957, represent what might be termed the two extremes in the study of the early books of the Bible. The documentary hypothesis of the nineteenth century was soon extended to take in the historical books, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, and the tendency in some quarters was to move to a more and more minute analysis of the documents. Against these extremists many Old Testament scholars raised protests. Some were inclined to think rather of blocks of tradition, and wanted to abandon the idea of documents altogether feeling that the idea was too artificial. Still others clung to the idea of an essentially Mosaic authorship or at least a basic origin for much of the material of the Pentateuch in the Mosaic era. Now two men return to the fray, representing the extreme fringes of the discussion.

G. T. Manley, in what he calls "an independent study of the evidence," seeks to discover whether the material of Deuteronomy could possibly have been written in the days of Moses. He argues that, by and large, it could. There is a great deal of analytical study of the text, which touches on the use of the divine names, geographical data, and a comparison of the code of Deuteronomy with the codes of J, E, H and P.

A chapter on the centralisation theory, the "keystone" of Wellhausen's hypothesis, argues that this theory is "anything but firmly fixed" (p. 127). Manley acknowledges his debt to authors with different views from his own, and uses them in his discussion. No doubt there will be a disagreement in detail with some of Manley's work, but the general impression left in the reader's mind will be that the older hypotheses will need some recasting if they are to give heed to the material collected here. There are difficulties with most theories, but this work of Manley is a valuable contribution to the discussion, and deserves careful consideration.

The work of C. S. Simpson follows on his work for the Hexateuch, where he found a tradition preserved by the southern tribes (J 1), which was later enlarged by traditions of the northern tribes (J 2), and merged with E which was also from the north. This theory is set out in the Introduction (pp. 1-7). Then follows a detailed analysis of Judges (pp. 9-107) in which the author attempts to work out the portions due to J1, J2, E, and the Redactor. Simpson gives a translation of these parts which preceded the Deuteronomistic reform (pp. 107-132). Certain Deuteronomistic material is next recognised (pp. 133-142), and the final stages of redaction indicated (pp. 142-147). The final pages in the book are Simpson's answer to his most outspoken critic, Eissfeldt (pp. 146-196).

One feels that despite the tremendous amount of detailed study of the text that Simpson has undertaken, there is something wrong about the whole method. Literature simply does not arise in this "paste and scissors" fashion. The final result of applying such methods to literature is too easily a matter of subjectivism. We of the twentieth century A.D. simply do not think as the ancients did, and when Simpson uses such items as lack of logic or consistency to justify the allotment of a verse or portion of a verse to a document, we question the

right of modern scholars to apply such criteria. The reviewer finds himself out of sympathy with the whole procedure. There is a considerable body of Old Testament scholarship to share this view today. Even the most acute and ingenious literary analysis will not suffice to separate out sources into individual words and phrases, much less permit us to draw far reaching conclusions from such analysis.

J. A. THOMPSON.

#### LUTHER'S WORKS, Vol. 14. *Selected Psalms III.*

Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis), 1958; XII and 368 pp.; \$5.00.

If the greatness of a theology can be measured by its ability to understand the Psalms, then our modern theology is at a very low ebb and needs a new study of the great exegetes of the Church who were able to penetrate into the depth of this timeless Hymn- and Prayer-book of the people of God of all ages, of the Old and the New Covenant, from which our Lord prayed Himself even in His agony on the cross. Outstanding among these exegetes is Luther. His exposition of the Psalms becomes theology in the old sense of Anselm and Augustine who wrote their deepest thoughts in the form of prayers, and of the Ancient Church which understood by "theology" the praise of God.

The present volume contains Ps. 117, 118—Luther's favourite psalm—and 147 (Vulgate, our Ps. 147:12-20). Then follows the explanation of the so-called "Seven Penitential Psalms" (6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143) which Luther as monk had prayed in the Laudes of the Fridays of Lent. All these expositions have been translated from German, as also "The Four Psalms of Comfort" (37, 62, 94, 109). They combine profound theological insights with the practical aspects of true pastoral care. The collection is concluded with the exposition of Ps. 1 and 2 from the second Lectures on the Psalter in Latin. They show the Reformer as lecturer. It would be impossible to enter here into a discussion of the rich content of this volume that in a certain way is a climax of the growing series of this edition. All aspects of Luther's theology are to be found in this volume which may well serve as an introduction into the biblical theology of the Reformer. The reader may begin with Ps. 18 and 2 and from there proceed to the Penitential Psalms. A careful study of this volume will show how the Church could and can pray the psalms, including the vindictive prayers against the enemies of God as prayers of faith (p. 244 ff.). The translators (G. Beto, A. Guebert, J. Pelikan, E. Sittler) have again done an admirable work, though, of course, their individualities are perceptible. The introductions are excellent, the footnotes illuminating and to the point with the exception of p. 204, n. 29, where such an important doctrine as that of justification seems to have been misunderstood in the sense of Osiander. It is not the doctrine of Luther that in the act of justification Christ's righteousness becomes our righteousness through "the personal presence of the indwelling Christ." This mystical misunderstanding of our unity with Christ has been read into Luther. Its danger has been clearly seen, not only by the Lutheran Church (Form. Conc. III), but also by Calvin in his elaborate rejection of Osiander Inst. III, ch. II. The outward appearance of the volumes is very good, the constant reference to the Weimar Edition is a great improvement. German words like the name Weiss must never be printed "Weisz" according to the rules of German printing.

H. SASSE.



## THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH

By Charles Caldwell Ryrie (Macmillan, New York), 1958, pp. 155; \$2.95.

## WOMAN IN THE CHURCH

By Russell C. Prohl (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1957, pp. 86; \$2.00.

The widespread diversity of contemporary opinion concerning the status of women in the Christian Church, especially in respect to their admission to the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, is reflected in these two small volumes, both of which emanate from Texas, U.S.A.

The author of the first, who is an Associate Professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, gives a balanced and comprehensive, if brief, survey of the place of women in the early Church, commencing with the Graeco-Roman and Jewish backgrounds and concluding with the third century Church Orders. Jesus introduced a revolutionary appraisal of women in recognising that their spiritual privilege was equal with men but concurrently maintained differences in their spiritual activity in that they were not chosen for official work, their special activity lying in the domestic sphere. With Paul, unity does not mean uniformity for the principle of differences and subordination (not to be confused with inferiority) is based on creation. Thus according to the New Testament teaching and pattern the place of women is that of "subordination and honour in the home, silence and helpfulness in the Church" (p. 146). Dr. Ryrie departs somewhat from the commonly accepted position in cogently maintaining, largely on the basis of the evidence of the *Apostolic Church Order* and the *Didascalia*, that the development of deaconesses as an official group came only in the third century in an indirect and broken line, their direct ancestors being not the ministering women of the days of the New Testament but the widows as they developed into a definite order.

The writer of the second volume is a minister of the Missouri Lutheran Church, the Synod of which in 1956 reaffirmed its traditional position of restricting the franchise in local congregations to males with but ten dissenting votes in a convention of six hundred. However, he is clearly out of sympathy with his more conservative brethren for, whilst fully admitting that the Scriptures (especially in Genesis and the Pauline writings) teach a subordination of wife to husband, he vigorously contends that this does not imply any general subordination of women to men. The Pauline restrictions, therefore, are directed only to married women, and, further, being only given to prevent a violation of contemporary customs which then, but not now, would be considered as a renunciation of marriage, they no longer need to be obeyed. However, the thesis that the Pauline directives are intended only for married and not unmarried women is most vulnerable. In the relevant passages (1 Cor. xi:2-16, xiv: 34, 5; 1 Tim. 2:11-5) questions of decency in public worship rather than decorum in marriage occupy the foreground. The contention is double-edged for if subordination is to be confined to marriage so also is interdependence. Tertullian in his day rejected the interpretation, with the conclusion that women should be admitted to the office of preaching, when he says: "If man is the head of the woman, then especially also of the virgin, who is the future married woman." This position is elucidated by Fritz Zerbst in his recent competent study, *The Office of Woman in the Church*, where he maintains that the relationships between the sexes always has its centre in marriage as an ordinance of creation which sets forth the fundamental principles of relationship between the sexes in general (e.g., the specific prohibition of adultery is inclusive of fornication in general). This is in conformity with the New Testament ethic as an

expanded family ethic. As to the Pauline restrictions, whilst the custom requiring the wearing of the veil, being adventitious to the basic position, was not long generally maintained in the early congregations, the prohibition against women authoritatively teaching in the Churches, as the necessary outcome of the order of creation (which is not annulled by the order of redemption) has as such universal permanency in the history of the Church.

These two diverse contributions will provide a useful addition to the growing corpus of literature on an issue which, as the continuing conflict in the Church of Sweden indicates, is of crucial importance in the life of the universal Church in the twentieth century.

R. SWANTON.

#### SHORTER NOTICES

*The Making of Luke-Acts*, by Henry J. Cadbury (S.P.C.K., London, Second Edition, 18/6) is still one of the important books in its field and, although first published over thirty years ago, is far from outmoded. Except for the correction of a few trifling misprints, this edition is photographically reproduced from the first, and it is good that it should again be available to New Testament students. As an altogether admirable introduction to the Lukan writings, it can continue to hold its place, both for its pleasantly readable style and for its wise, penetrating, even though sometimes reluctant, scholarship. It is lively, comprehensive, and quite up to date, except only in references to "recent" literature. In four main divisions, the study deals with (1) the materials available to the author, (2) contemporary literary methods, (3) the author's personal traits and interests, and (4) his purpose in writing; and, grouped under these wider heads, the separate chapters discuss a variety of fascinating themes. For example, the then (1927) rapidly growing cult of form-criticism receives adequate notice, yet there is a firm and reasoned refusal to succumb to its blandishments. On this and other matters, Professor Cadbury has seen little reason for reversing earlier judgments.

*The First Epistle of Peter*, by F. W. Beare (Blackwell, Oxford, Second Edition, 41/6 Aust.). The first edition of this important study was published almost contemporaneously with Dean Selwyn's massive commentary, and consequently neither author had been able to utilise the other's work. Special interest was attached to their publication because the two commentaries approached the Epistle from contrasting points of view. Now Professor Beare has given some attention to Dean Selwyn's views. He has not modified his main positions on questions of Introduction or on general interpretation of the Epistle, but some notes have been added within the body of the commentary, where space permitted, and the account of the ancient versions has been largely re-written. A bibliography of recent writings appears, and indexes have now been furnished. The second edition is larger than the first by some thirty pages. Special supplementary notes discuss Dean Selwyn's defence of Petrine authorship and the Silvanus hypothesis, the quest for source materials or forms in the Church's common tradition, the nature and purpose of the Epistle, and the place of writing. Professor Beare now favours a Roman origin.

*The Amplified New Testament* (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, \$3.95) is primarily the work of Frances E. Siewert, reviewed by a special editorial committee. It is an English translation of the New Testament from the text of Westcott and Hort. It is intended to supplement other versions by endeavouring to convey the richness of the multi-shaded meanings of the original with the aid of additional

phrases of meaning and clarifying words or comments. Thus, despite the frequency of brackets and footnotes, it presents a useful and compact commentary on many phrases, and will doubtless find its place alongside modern translations. Homer has nodded in the Introduction where statements regarding pronouns need recasting. What is asserted of Greek is incorrect and gives rise in the translation to the solecism, "Our Father Who is in heaven" (Mt. vi. 9; compare Lk. xi. 2, and Rev. xi. 17, xvi. 5).

C. S. Petrie.

*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* and *Princeton Sermons*, by Charles Hodge (Banner of Truth Trust, 78b Chiltern Street, London, W.1, 11/6 and 13/6). Formed for the purpose of re-issuing long out-of-print classical works in the Evangelical Reformed tradition, the Banner of Truth Trust among its first publications has included these works of the author of *Systematic Theology* fame. In the line of Calvin the theology of the Princetonian was Scripturally based and practically directed, for the first volume (a member in the Geneva Series of Commentaries intended to cover each of the books of the Bible) manifests the honesty, clarity and insight of the exegete; and the second (an outline of discourses delivered to students at the Seminary), whilst reflecting the formal analytical schematisation of the last century, relates "the great themes of theology," as Professor John Murray observes in his Foreword, "to the most practical concerns of the Christian and pastor." The new publishing Trust is to be commended for producing such valuable writings in an attractive form (through the photo-litho process) at a most reasonable price.

*The Select Works of Jonathan Edwards*, Vol. I (Banner of Truth Trust, 8/-); *Edwards Sermon Outlines*, selected and edited by S. B. Quincer, and *Jonathan Edwards on Evangelism*, edited by J. C. Wolf (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, \$2.50 and \$2.00). The bi-centenary in 1958 of his death has aroused new interest in the philosopher-theologian and preacher-evangelist of Colonial America. The first volume, commencing an enterprising British project, introduced by a useful memoir (with bibliography) by I. H. Murray, contains the text of "A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God" and three sermons. The second (Vol. 5 of "The World's Great Sermons in Outline") embodies a comprehensive survey of thirty-five sermons and the third a valuable anthology-digest, concisely expresses Edwards' penetrating observations on revivalism. Modern evangelism may learn much from the theologian of the Great Awakening with his correlation of divine sovereignty and experiential faith.

*The Glorious Body of Christ*, by R. B. Kuiper (Eerdmans, \$4.95). This popular presentation of the Reformed doctrine of the Church has been partly occasioned by the contemporary focussing of attention on ecclesiology. Whilst throughout the traditional distinction between the visible and invisible Church is maintained, it is insisted that visibility and invisibility are but different aspects of the one Church of Jesus Christ. On the debatable question of Church union the writer steers a middle course of realistic idealism between the extremes of uniformity and multiformity. The discussion on the nature and function of the Church covers a wide field with sections on the basic message, offices, worship and discipline. Professor Kuiper makes considerable use of apt illustration, and has the gift of pointed expression, e.g., "he who today forbids what God allows will almost certainly tomorrow allow what God forbids" (268). Here is a valuable discussion of Calvinistic concepts in contemporary terminology.



*The Church of the Earliest Christians*, by William M. Ramsay (John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, \$3.00). In this volume the writer analyses the earliest Christian teaching as embodied in the sermons of Peter, Stephen and Paul, recorded in the first thirteen chapters of Acts, and deduces the fact that here Jesus stands in a relationship to the Church comparable to that of God Himself. From the centre of the Christology of the first preaching the basic N.T. concepts radiate like the spokes of a wheel from the hub — the heavenly Conqueror (Revelation), the great High Priest (Hebrews), a Man on earth (Synoptics), the First-born from the dead (Pauline), a living and present power (Johannine). This suggestive presentation of a most important aspect of Christian origins well deserves the strong commendation expressed in the Foreword by Professor James Stewart, of Edinburgh.

*Creation and Fall*, by Dietrich Bonhoeffer (S.C.M., London, 8/6). This theological interpretation of Genesis 1-3 follows the general line of Barthian interpretation *sub specie Christo* for "only in the Word of creation do we know the Creator, in the Word in the middle do we have the beginning" (20). Within created being Bonhoeffer considers the formless, form in rhythm, form in law and number, the living culminating in the final work of man the likeness of whom to God is not *analogia entis* but *analogia relationis*. The crux of the first religious, theological conversation is the setting of God and *sicut deus* man against God and *imago dei* man, which is only resolved by *agnus dei*, the One who kills man's false divinity in true divinity. This little book is full of suggestive insights, e.g., "Conscience is not the voice of God to sinful man, it is man's defence against it, but as this defence it points towards it, contrary to our will and knowledge" (83).

*Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 26, by J. T. Malik (S.C.M., 12/6). Based upon a close study of the archaeological and palaeological evidence of the recent discoveries with which he has been intimately associated, the writer of this monograph (which has been translated from the French original), identifying the Qumran community with the Essenes, discusses its history, organisation and teachings. The conclusion is reached that "although Essenism bore in itself more than one element that one way or another fertilised the soil from which Christianity was to spring, it is nevertheless evident that the latter religion represents something completely new which can only be adequately explained by the person of Jesus Himself" (143). Characterised by thoroughness of treatment and balance of judgment, this study is amply illustrated by plates and maps including the construction of a detailed and striking plan of the settlement at Qumran.

*The Kingdom of Christ*, by Frederick Denison Maurice, edited by Alec R. Vidler (S.C.M. Press, 2 vols., 15/- each). Regarded by many as the greatest Anglican theologian of the nineteenth century, Maurice, in this his most important work discusses "the principles, constitution and ordinances of the Catholic Church" in contrast with what he regards as man-made systems, schools and parties. The son of a Unitarian minister with a close association with the Quakers, Maurice had an intimate knowledge of a wide and varied manifestation of religious thought, although it is apparent that some of his judgments are rather superficial as when he declares that the Calvinist system "makes the fall of man the central point of its divinity" (11/302). Despite obscurities of style, Maurice, in the words of his editor, often articulates "profound and seminal thoughts," so that, in this age of ecclesiological discussion, the republication of this influential book (from the second edition of 1842) which has long been out of print, is most welcome.

R. Swanton.

## Book Reviews

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| BERKOUWER, G. C.: <i>The Conflict with Rome</i> . . . . .                                       | 55   |
| By the Rev. Professor Klaas Runia, Th.D., Reformed<br>Theological College, Geelong, Vic.        |      |
| HENSHAW, T.: <i>The Latter Prophets</i> . . . . .   | 57   |
| By the Rev. Professor L. G. Geering, M.A., B.D., Emmanuel<br>College, University of Queensland. |      |
| MALEVEZ, L.: <i>The Christian Message and Myth</i> . . . . .                                    | 58   |
| By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College,<br>University of Otago.          |      |
| MANLEY, G. T.: <i>The Book of the Law</i> . . . . .   | 59   |
| By J. A. Thompson, Esq., M.A., M.Sc., B.D., B.Ed., Baptist<br>Theological College, Sydney.      |      |
| SIMPSON, C. A.: <i>Composition of the Book of Judges</i> . . . . .                              | 59   |
| By J. A. Thompson, Esq.   |      |
| PELIKAN, Jaroslav (Ed.): <i>Luther's Works, Vol 14</i> . . . . .                                | 60   |
| By the Rev. Professor Hermann Sasse, D.Theol., Immanuel<br>Theological Seminary, Adelaide.      |      |
| PROHL, Russell C.: <i>Woman in the Church</i> . . . . .   | 61   |
| By the Rev. Robert Swanton, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.  |      |
| RYRIE, Charles Caldwell: <i>The Place of Women in the Church</i> ..                             | 61   |
| By the Rev. R. Swanton.   |      |
| SHORTER NOTICES . . . . .   | 62   |



